EUROBATS

EUROBATS National Implementation Report MoP9

This questionnaire reflects obligations of the Parties listed in Resolution 8.11 Implementation of the Conservation and Management Plan (2019 - 2022) and other effective Resolutions.

In case of technical issues and questions, please use a support center button in the bottom before contacting the Secretariat.

A. General Information

Name of your country
››› Romania

Period covered by this report
››› 2019-2022

Is your country a party to EUROBATS Agreement?
☑ Yes

Competent authority

Title, address, phone, fax, e-mail and other contact details
››› Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests
Bvd. Libertăţii nr. 12, District 5, Bucharest
Email: cabinet.ministru@mmediu.ro
Phone/Fax: +4 021 408 95 46/+4 021 316 02 87
Web: http://www.mmediu.ro

Personal details of administrative focal point (s)
››› Antoaneta Oprișan
Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests
Email: antoaneta.oprisan@mmediu.ro
Phone: +40 21 408 9546
Web: http://www.mmediu.ro

Please give details of designated scientifical focal points
››› Szilárd-Lehel Bücs
Centre for Bat Research and Conservation
Email: szilardbux@gmail.com, contact@lilieci.ro
Phone: +40747921684
Web: www.lilieci.ro

Compilers and contributors to this report
››› Csaba Jére, Myotis Bat Conservation Group
Dragoș Ștefan Măntoiu, Wilderness Research and Conservation
Levente Barti, Myotis Bat Conservation Group

Bats species which occur in the territory

Please select only species which were recorded from your country

Species: Rhinolophus blasii Peters, 1866

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Rhinolophus euryale Blasius, 1853

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› Note: maximum population size for the whole country (2300 individuals) in the new report is probably erroneous, not taking into known data and published records.

Species: Rhinolophus ferrumequinum (Schreber, 1774)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. Mora data available.

Species: Rhinolophus hipposideros (Borkhausen, 1797)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Rhinolophus mehelyi Matschie, 1901

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Barbastella barbastellus (Schreber, 1774)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available, but maximum population size for the whole country (4500 individuals) in the new report is highly erroneous, not taking into known data.

Species: Eptesicus nilssonii (Keyserling & Blasius, 1839)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Eptesicus serotinus (Schreber, 1774)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Hypsugo savii (Bonaparte, 1837)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From XX to FV. More data available.

Species: Myotis alcathoe von Helversen & Heller, 2001

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis davidii (Peters, 1869)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis bechsteinii (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text

boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› Note: maximum population size for the whole country (1800 individuals) in the new report is probably erroneous, not taking into known data.

Species: Myotis blythii (Tomes, 1857)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Myotis brandtii (Eversmann, 1845)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis capaccinii (Bonaparte, 1837)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› Note: maximum population size for the whole country (2600 individuals) in the new report is probably erroneous, not taking into known data and published records.

Species: Myotis dasycneme (Boie, 1825)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.

☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis daubentonii (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis emarginatus (Geoffroy, 1806)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend

☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis myotis (Borkhausen, 1797)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Myotis mystacinus (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Myotis nattereri (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Nyctalus lasiopterus (Schreber, 1780)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From XX to U1. More data available.

Species: Nyctalus leisleri (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Nyctalus noctula (Schreber, 1774)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Pipistrellus kuhlii (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Pipistrellus nathusii (Keyserling & Blasius, 1839)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Pipistrellus pipistrellus (Schreber, 1774)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Pipistrellus pygmaeus (Leach, 1825)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Plecotus auritus (Linnaeus, 1758)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Plecotus austriacus (Fischer, 1829)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ No

Species: Vespertilio murinus Linnaeus, 1758

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available.

Species: Miniopterus schreibersii (Kuhl, 1817)

Status of the species within the territory

Status of occurence

Please give details if the species is not resident. E.g. year of extinction, description of occasional findings etc. Text boxes are expandable.
☑ Resident: breeding
☑ Resident: hibernation

Conservational status

Overall national trend
☑ Not studied

Status in the National Red List

Please indicate status of the species in the national red data list or similar document
››› Not evaluated

Natura2000 or Emerald reports

Has the national status reported under the Article 17 of the Habitat Directive(2019) or for the Emerald network (non-EU countries) changed since the previous assessment?

☑ Yes

If yes, explain reasons for changes or provide a link to the report
››› From U1 to FV. More data available, but maximum population size for the whole country (26000 individuals) in the new report is highly erroneous, not taking into published literature.

1. Legal Requirements

Resolution 4.6. Guidelines for the issue of permits for the capture and study of captured wild bats

Does the system of permits or licenses for the capture of bats exist in your country?
☑ No

System of permits or licences for the keeping of bats for educational or animal welfare purposes

☑ Doesn't exist

System of permits or licences for sampling, ringing, killing of bats for scientific study
☑ Doesn't exist

Comments
››› Regarding capture: The only standing legal and administrative framework for permitting the study of bats using capture is the regulation for derogations according to the Art. 16 of the Habitats Directive. However, this process is lengthy and confusing, in many cases applicants receiving no answer from the official bodies responsible for this permit, or they receive it with serious delays. Also, there is a working permit system for accessing caves for various activities (including scientific research, capturing bats at caves, sampling bats, etc.), managed by the Speleological Heritage Commission, working under the Ministry of Environment. An unofficial ethical guideline exists since 2017 on the Romanian bat portal (https://lilieci.ro/en/bat-research/ethical-bat-research/), created jointly by the Romanian bat research community.
Regarding educational / aninal welfare purposes: There are provisions inside several laws, for preventing the keeping of wild animals (Law no. 49/2011, Law no. 205/2014), or which inhibit keepers to maintain bats in small enclosures (Law of Zoos no. 191/2002), but this later law does not take into account artificial hibernation, which should be done in small spaces. Also, veterinarians may keep (while under treatment) animals for a short period of time (however this is not regulated by any law, and is tacitly accepted). With the existence of a rehabilitation center in Bucharest (by the Luana Wild Animal Rehabilitation Centre), new legislative proposals should be developed to address this aspect.
For sampling / ringing / research: As above, a lengthy, confusing system of permits exists to capture, sample and ring bats, but only for Annex II DH species. However, there are no official standards for ringing, efforts suffering from lack of (1) coordination, (2) specific training and (3) a centralized database.

Resolution 6.5. Guidelines on ethics for research and field work practices

National Code of Practice that addresses the context and legitimacy of acquisition, due diligence, long-term care, documentation, relevance and institutional aims
☑ Doesn't exist

Other activities carried out under this resolution (optional)
››› An unofficial ethical guideline exists since 2017 on the Romanian bat portal (https://lilieci.ro/en/bat-research/ethical-bat-research/), created jointly by Romanian bat research community.

Please, give details of the legislation which is protecting bats
››› ● Law nr. 13/1993, ratifying the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats in Europe.
● Law nr. 13/1998, ratifying the Bonn Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals.
● Law nr. 90/2000, ratifying the Convention on the Conservation of Bats in Europe, the EUROBATS Agreement.
● Governmental Emergency Ordinance no. 57/2007 on the regime of natural protected areas, conservation of natural habitats, wild flora and fauna, approved with further amendments and additions by Law no. 49/2011, as amended and supplemented (to apply European Council Directives nr. 92/43/EEC and nr. 79/409/EEC, the Habitats Directive).
● Law nr. 205/2004, on the protection of animals, republished, with further amendments and additions.
● Ministerial Ordinance nr. 656/2014 (the Batlife Ordinance), to approve the regional action plan for the management of R. ferrumequinum, R. hipposideros, M. myotis, M. oxygnathus (blythii), M. bechsteinii, B. barbastellus and M. schreibersii.
Due to the sustained, multi-year efforts of several Romanian bat NGOs', there has been a significant positive evolution with regard to the public attitude and awareness towards bats. However, there is a great need to apply the existing legislation in a focused manner (ex. in specific cases of high importance roost, caves, historic buildings and habitats). In addition, apparent legislative paradoxes need to be resolved. For example, Order no. 656/2014 regarding the approval of the regional action plan for the management of bat species "Rhinolophus ferrumequinum", "Rhinolophus hipposideros", "Myotis myotis", "Myotis oxygnathus", "Myotis bechsteinii", "Barbastella barbastellus", "Miniopterus schreibersii" (Ministry of Environment and Climate Change) states that some caves in North-Western Romania are subject to seasonal restrictions for tourism, thereby protecting resident colonies in critical periods. However, tens of other similarly (or more important) caves and colonies exist in other parts of the country (ex. the Banat region, Dobrogea, Moldova), that are not subject to seasonal restrictions, even if colonies are threatened by the same human activities. A serious problem is also the renovation of historic buildings, especially churches, where usually resident nursery colonies are rarely taken into account, with conflicting legislation also in case of bats vs. historic buildings. Religious tourism also threatens some key colonies, ex. in the Dobrogea region. Another important issue is that of wind energy in a bat migratory corridor in eastern Romania, in the Dobrogea region. So far, some studies have been performed and limited curtailment measures have been implemented, but it is far from a national practice.
Romania has a particular law enforcement, as more than one institution has law enforcement power, with

different (usually geographic) levels of intervention, which overlap in most cases (eg. local Environmental Protection Agencies, local Agencies for Natural Protected Areas, Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Management Authority, local and regional Forestry Services, local and regional Forestry and Salmoniculture Authorities, local and county Councils, local and regional Infrastructure Management and etc.). Due to their own management and institutional regulations sometimes could appear conflicting situations in law enforcement, but these challenges and legislative voids will be solved in the upcoming years, in order to reflect the continental importance, size and diversity of local bat populations, as well as the threats faced by them.

Which species are not protected and why?
››› All bat species are protected by law.

2. Population survey and monitoring

Resolution 2.2. Consistent monitoring methodologies

Implementation of EUROBATS guidelines published in EUROBATS Publication n°5 to ensure consistency and information exchange between Parties and Range States
☑ Yes

Please give details
››› Monitoring of Romanian bats mostly follows EUROBATS guidelines, and is undertaken in key seasons: summer (nurseries), autumn (swarming) and winter (hibernation). We apply several standard methods, including colony counts at hibernation and nursery sites, emergence counts, surveys and monitoring at swarming sites (mist-netting and harp-trapping), bat detector surveys, as well as automated recordings in some cases.

Resolution 5.4. Monitoring bats across Europe

Involvement in a long-term pan-European surveillance to provide trend data
☑ No

Awareness-raising of the importance of underground sites
☑ Yes

Collaboration and information exchange with other Parties and range states on surveillance and monitoring activities
☑ Yes

Please provide details
››› Regarding important underground sites: All activities (conferences, events, presentations, online activity) undertaken by bat NGOs and institutions from Romania include details about the importance of Romanian underground roosts, as well as methods of protecting resident colonies. The official recognition for the list of continentally and nationally important underground roosts for bats would greatly improve both their conservation and the awareness surrounding them. The Centre for Bat Research and Conservation, in partnership with the Myotis Bat Conservation Group also implemented (in 2018-2019) a project to actively involve cavers and caver clubs in bat monitoring and conservation.
Regarding collaboration / information exchange: The Centre for Bat Research and Conservation and Myotis Bat Conservation Group currently run a cross-border project with Serbian bat researchers, based on the sighting of bats carrying Serbian rings in Romanian caves. The project is financed by the Conservation Leadership Programme, and aims to establish cross border conservation for colonies “shared” by the two countries. Details can be found here. We also take part in the Bat Migration Routes in Europe Project, by supplying ultrasound data.
Wilderness Research and Conservation NGO is currently working on a project involving the identification of migration flightpaths for bats on and near the Black Sea with the Ukrainian researchers, and also collaborates within the bat migration via ultrasounds EUROBATS funded project, with the Museum of Natural History from Paris, France.

Monitoring bats in accordance with EUROBATS Publication n°5
☑ Yes

Capacity building of bat workers and surveyors to support the undertaking of bat surveillance projects
☑ Doesn't exist

Resolution 6.13. Bats as indicators for biodiversity

Does your country support a development of national, regional and pan-European biodiversity indicators for appropriate target audiences, using bat data
☑ No

Bat data is incorporated within high profile national multi-taxa indicators
☑ No

Cooperation platforms that facilitate the required data exchange
☑ Don't exist

Resolution 7.7. Bat conservation and sustainable forest management

National guidance has been developed based on the principles in the EUROBATS Bats and Forestry leaflet
☑ No

Examples of best practice for forest management are submitted to the Secretariat
☑ No

If no, provide explanations or give links to available examples
››› There are no best example practices involving forest management for bats in Romania. The only provisions are the exact details included in the management plans of protected areas, regarding the retention of hollow trees, dead wooden materials etc.

Resolution 7.10. Bat Rescue and Rehabilitation

Animal rescue and rehabilitation systems are effective in the country
☑ Yes

Collaboration between bat rehabilitators and scientists
☑ Exists

Provide examples of collaboration
››› All involved NGOs and other structures have open communication channels towards the public. In case a local NGO is contacted about a bat-related issue from some other region in Romania, the call and the problem is forwarded to the nearest bat expert, which might be from another NGO. Also, bat experts in NGOs collaborate with several veterinary experts from various NGOs or universities in case of injured bats. The Center for Wildlife Rescue and Rehabilitation ”Visul Luanei” from Bucharest is still strongly active in case of major trauma for bats.

Bat rehabilitators submit their data to a national database
☑ Yes

Please provide information about this database
››› The Center for Wildlife Rescue and Rehabilitation ”Visul Luanei” keeps records of its activity, which can be provided upon request.

Other activities carried out under Resolution 7.10 (optional)
››› (1) Public events (ex. feeding sessions) for trained members of the public how to handle bats, organized by the Wilderness Research and Conservation and Visul Luanei Foundation
(2) Various informative materials for the public and decision makers:
- Best practice guidelines for the general public, authorities, veterinarians, bat specialists (in Romanian), created by the Wilderness Research and Conservation (http://www.wildernessrc.ro/resurse/ghid2018/)
- Section about “Contact with bats” on the Romanian bat portal (in three languages, RO, HU and EN), managed by the Centre for Bat Research and Conservation: https://lilieci.ro/en/bat-protection/around-bats/
- A video which sums up the rehabilitation process in Bucharest (with English subtitles): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IhvvbVEOU4M
Data was submitted to the IWG on this topic, about aprox. 2800-3200 bats rescued in period 2014-2021 by all Romanian organizations combined, for a total of 13 species (N. noctula, N. leisleri, V. murinus, P. pipistrellus, P. pygmaeus, P. nathusii, P. kuhlii, E. serotinus, P. auritus, P. austriacus, M. emarginatus, M. daubentonii, M. capaccinii). A minimum of 21 people are involved currently in bat rehabilitation in Romania, from 5 NGOs and 1 University.

Resolution 7.12. Priority species for autecological studies

Priority Species
Rhinolophus blasii Peters, 1866

Some studies have been conducted (are ongoing) for this species in the country
☑ Yes

The species occures in the country and some studies have been done

Studies on:

	Swarming sites	Winter roosts	Summer roosts	Migration	Spatial and habitat use	Foraging behaviour	Diet
Yes	☑	☑	☑	☐	☐	☐	☐
No	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please add below or attach a list of references
››› - Bücs Sz.-L.: Peștera Zidită de la Mada: reconfirmarea Rhinolophus blasii după 60+ ani. Conferința Națională de Chiropterologie din România, ediția IV, Octombrie 2020, mediul online.
- Bücs Sz.L., Csorba G. (2022): Blasius's Horseshoe Bat Rhinolophus blasii Peters, 1867. In: Hackländer K., Zachos F.E. (eds) Handbook of the Mammals of Europe. Handbook of the Mammals of Europe. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65038-8_41-1
- Jakab E., Bücs Sz., Jére C., Csősz I., Jakab R.I., Szodoray-Parádi F., Popescu O. (2022): Low Population Structure and Genetic Diversity in Rhinolophus blasii at the Northern Limit of Its European Range: Are there Undiscovered Colonies? Acta Chiropterologica 23(2):301-311.

Resolution 8.3. Monitoring of daily and seasonal movements of bats

Studies on daily/seasonal movements

References

Provide references to completed or ongoing studies on daily/seasonal movements of bats in your country in the text field below or attach a file
››› - Bücs Sz.L., Csősz I., Barti L., Budinski I., Pejić B., Bogosavljević J., Gönczi Vass I., Szigeti M., Bodea F., Crețu G., Dumbravă A., Jumanca M., Jére Cs.: Chiropterofauna Banatului: migrație și conservare transfrontalieră. A XIII-a Conferință de Chiropterologie din Ungaria, Octombrie 2021, Lakitelek, Ungaria.
- Bücs Sz.-L.: Peștera Zidită de la Mada: reconfirmarea Rhinolophus blasii după 60+ ani. Conferința Națională de Chiropterologie din România, ediția IV, Octombrie 2020, mediul online.
- Bücs Sz.L., Csorba G. (2022): Blasius's Horseshoe Bat Rhinolophus blasii Peters, 1867. In: Hackländer K., Zachos F.E. (eds) Handbook of the Mammals of Europe. Handbook of the Mammals of Europe. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65038-8_41-1
- Frantz A.C., Viglino A., Wilwert E., Cruz, A.-P., Wittische J., Weigand A.M., Buijk J., Nyssen P., Dekeukeleire D., Dekker J.J.A., Horsburgh G.J., Schneider S., Lang M., Caniglia R., Galaverni M., Schleimer A., Bücs Sz.-L., Pir J.B. (2022): Conservation by trans-border cooperation: population genetic structure and diversity of geoffroy's bat (Myotis emarginatus) at its north-western european range edge. Biodiversity and Conservation https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-022-02371-3.
- Jakab E., Bücs Sz., Jére C., Csősz I., Jakab R.I., Szodoray-Parádi F., Popescu O. (2022): Low Population Structure and Genetic Diversity in Rhinolophus blasii at the Northern Limit of Its European Range: Are there Undiscovered Colonies? Acta Chiropterologica 23(2):301-311.
- Dragoş Ştefan Măntoiu, Kseniia Kravchenko, Linn Sophia Lehnert, Anton Vlaschenko, Oana Teodora Moldovan, Ionuţ Cornel Mirea, Răzvan Cătălin Stanciu, Răzvan Zaharia, Răzvan Popescu-Mirceni, Marius Costin Nistorescu, Christian Claus Voigt. (2022) Wildlife and infrastructure: impact of wind turbines on bats in the Black Sea coast region, European journal of wildlife research, 66 (3): 1-13

Resolution 8.4 Wind Turbines and Bat Populations

Raising awareness on the impact of turbines on bats and the existence of some unsuitable habitats or sites for construction
☑ Yes

If yes, how?
››› Lobby for bat conservation within the government and consulting the Ministry of Environment on new proposed wind turbine laws. Also presentations in schools and bat nights at various events.

Are impact assessment procedures and post-construction monitoring undertaken by appropriately experienced experts?
☑ Yes

Please, give details
››› The pre-assessment methods have become much more aligned with the World Bank requirements. We initially use a field visit to check the site, and afterwards we construct the bat survey study according to the local topography, habitats and project design, following EUROBATS guidelines, but also BCT and other national and international guides. We use acoustic monitoring in the following way: car transects, walking transects, point counts in transects and static detectors deployed at a minimum of 5 points per site, for at least 5 nights a month. We perform roost searches and additional studies where needed, e.g. emergence studies or habitat use observations.
All of these extra steps which were not pursued in the initial wind energy development wave (2007-2013), are not recommended by the governmental authorities, but only by the experts (negotiation with the beneficiary), or the World Bank consultants (or other large financing entities). We are currently experiencing a new massive wind energy development wave, which already included 3 new off-shore proposals.
Currently very little post-construction monitoring studies are undertaken as recommended, with one continuous example at the Babadag Wind Park, which is the only wind park in Romania which applies curtailment measures for some of its turbines, successfully trimming down mortality rates from one of the largest values ever recorded in Europe (Măntoiu et al. 2020), to less than 5% of the initial state in current conditions. Most post-construction studies are performed with visiting frequencies of less than 1 per month, which is not acceptable for any carcass search methodology.

National guidelines have been developed following Eurobats Pub. No. 6
☑ Yes

Please, attach a file or or provide a link
››› Yes, but only in Romanian, and it is not an official national guideline: https://lilieci.ro/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ghid_Doba_et_al_Eoliene.pdf

National guidelines are implemented
☑ Partially

Please, provide implementation details
››› It depends on local politics, personnel involved in surveying, and park managers. It depends if wind park managers are willing to apply post construction and mitigation measures. The only effective reglementary institution is the World Bank and other large financing etities.

Investigations and research for mitigating bat mortality have been undertaken
☑ Yes

Please, list references, attach reports and articles
››› ● Măntoiu DȘ, Kseniia Kravchenko, Linn Sophia Lehnert, Anton Vlaschenko, Oana Teodora Moldovan, Ionuţ Cornel Mirea, Răzvan Cătălin Stanciu, Răzvan Zaharia, Răzvan Popescu-Mirceni, Marius Costin Nistorescu, Christian Claus Voigt. (2020) Wildlife and infrastructure: impact of wind turbines on bats in the Black Sea coast region, European journal of wildlife research, 66 (3): 1-13

Post-construction monitoring, if possible, is undertaken by suitably experienced bat experts

If yes, give details
☑ Yes

››› Partially and locally. Post-construction monitoring is undertaken by suitably experienced bat experts, but they are limited by the study design. There are few projects which implement best practice guidelines, with most projects having a carcass search frequency of less than 1 visit per month. After the contract with the large financing entities is fulfilled and the wind park managers usually revert to something appealing for the EPA (a non optimal study design).

Developers of wind energy projects and responsible authorities make raw data from impact assessment and post-construction monitoring available for independent analysis.
☑ Yes

Please, list references, attach reports and articles
››› Officially yes, but the data is far from complete. Each time a carcass is found, the wind park managers must inform the local EPA, which should send a team in the field to investigate. This is not the case, and most carcasses are not reported, therefore the official national database of accidental kills in regards to wind energy is incomplete. The data which was collected and sent in the Report of the IWG on Wind Turbines and Bat Populations (14th Meeting of the Standing Committee, 23rd Meeting of the Advisory Committee, Tallinn, Estonia, 14-17 May 2018), was put together by bat specialists who have collaborated off topic in order to comprehend the severity of the current situation. Although bat mortalities are reported to EPAs, the data is made public only very late or never. Also, environmental assessment teams only show conclusion of their

studies in order to keep the contract with the park and never show raw data. A few best practice examples of such projects include collecting the carcases and storing them at the “Grigore Antipa” National Museum of Natural History, after necropsies have been done by veterinary specialists (Babadag Wind Park Project run by Martifer and monitored by SC Wilderness Research and Consultancy SRL).

Measures such as blade feathering, higher turbine cut-in wind speeds and shutting down turbines are implemented
☑ Yes

Please, provide details
››› The study performed by Măntoiu et al. (2020) at the Babadag wind park shows a successful mitigation procedure (feathering), and the project continues to this date, with regular ultrasound and carcass monitoring surveys plus mitigation measure optimization procedures. This example is unfortunately unique, but the new proposed wind projects should be mitigated from the start.

Resolution 8.10 Recommended Experience and Skills of Experts with regard to Quality of Assessments

Compliance with Annex to Resolution 8.10

Experts/groups of experts carrying out assessment of projects, plans and programmes on populations of European bats meet the minimum standard of skills, knowledge and experience as described in the Annex to Resolution 8.10
☑ Yes, completely or partially

If yes

Please provide details
››› In case of elaborating the management plans for protected areas, where Annex II bat species are listed in the standard form of the Natura 2000, bat experts with appropriate credentials / experience are included in the evaluation teams. In case of environmental impact assessments, this does not happen in all cases, evaluation teams often missing bat experts or having bat evaluations included in their final documentation, that were inappropriately / incompletely done by non-experts.

3. Roosts

Resolution 4.5. Guidelines for the use of remedial timber treatment

Small projects to provide basic data to allow an assessment of the potential impact of industry on bat populations
☑ No

Raising awareness of product users is taking place
☑ Yes

Please provide details
››› Some interpersonal discussions with architects and engineers about bat friendly substances and specific bat conservation approaches are taking place, however, these efforts would be greatly enhanced by official and/or legal positions and guidance.

Legislation on products which have any adverse effects on bats
☑ Doesn't exist

Comments (optional)
››› Only an unofficial guideline was developed by the Romanian Bat Protection Association, in frame of a Norwegian Grant, and distributed across Romania, including at a specific, building renovation conference: https://lilieci.ro/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/ghid_APLR_adaposturi_antropice.pdf

Resolution 5.7. Guidelines for the protection of overground roosts, with particular reference to roosts in buildings of cultural heritage importance

List of national important overground roosts (including legal/physical protection status)
☑ Doesn't exist

National guidelines for custodians of historical buildings on the protection of bat roosts have been developed

☑ No

Summary report on interactions between the relevant cultural and natural heritage agencies (attach a file or provide a description)
››› In the present moment we know of approx. 45-50 historic buildings that offer roost to large colonies of R. ferrumequinum, R. hipposideros, R. euryale, M. myotis, M. blythii, M. emarginatus and others. However, the true number of historic buildings and other overground roosts with potentially large colonies probably exceeds 100. In some cases, bat researchers are reluctant to give away information about the exact location of such colonies (in order to protect them from the public), and try to deal with threat situations as they arise. Most known colonies in historic buildings are described from North-Western, South-Western and Central Romania. Currently there is no specific legislation to protect building-dwelling colonies, and in many cases, colonies are threatened in frame of historic building renovation that, even if informed about, ignore the legislation about bats. Usually interventions and renovations take place without accounting for the presence of nursery colonies. A national and official approach is needed in order to better protect the colonies roosting in historic buildings.
There is no legal ground for statutory protection for these roosts, the only way to maintain them is the close cooperation with owners and managers, an activity which usually is beyond the capacity of the Romanian bat protection societies, limiting thus their efforts to a few and individual cases. The creation of the official list of colonies from historic buildings and other important overground roosts is highly needed to work towards their effective conservation. The development of an official and national guideline and a legislative update would also improve the situation.
Only an unofficial guideline was developed by the Romanian Bat Protection Association, in frame of a Norwegian Grant in the period of 2014-2016, and distributed across Romania, including at a specific, building renovation conference:
● Jére Cs., Bücs Sz. (2016): Conservation of bat species in anthropic roosts. Methodological guideline. [Conservarea speciilor de lilieci în adăposturi antropice. Ghid methodologic]. In frame of project “Long term conservation of bat colonies from anthropic roosts with the involvement of local communities”. Ed. Profundis. pp. 48. ISBN 978-973-1979-45-8.
https://lilieci.ro/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/ghid_APLR_adaposturi_antropice.pdf
Another best practice guideline has focused on general practices or relocation measures for bats in buildings:
● Wilderness Research and Conservation Association, Măntoiu D.Ş. et al. (2018), funded by the IKEA Urban Fund - http://www.wildernessrc.ro/resurse/ghid2018/

Other activities carried out under this resolution (optional)
››› Locally, there is good communication between NGOs and decision makers of cultural heritage buildings (ex. priests) in order to maintain a close look upon the status of known colonies. However, there are always surprises, and accidental discoveries of important buildings already in renovation. Currently several NGOs and independent experts oversee the renovation of some historic sites in Romania, including also activities like informing decision makers through interpersonal contact, regular cleaning of accumulated guano, and education for local communities. However, there is also one case of intentional colony destruction (= excluding) of R. euryale, M. myotis, My blythii and M. emarginatus during the renovation of a historic church in Transylvania, that is being investigated (for 3 years!) by local authorities.
In the period of 2019-2022, the Centre for Bat Research cleaned pro-bono the accumulated guano from under colonies in six historic locations, in order to convince local colonies to conserve, or at least tolerate resident bat colonies.

Resolution 7.6. Guidelines for the protection and management of important underground habitats for bats

List of important underground sites for bats and measures of their protection (including Natura 2000, Emerald or other status) was submitted to EUROBATS
☑ Yes

When the latest update was submitted?
››› The latest update was submitted at the AC in Heraklion, in 2014, bringing the total number of Romanian important underground sites to 57. Since the submission of the updated list at the AC in Heraklion in 2014, several new discoveries were made, some of which of continental importance. Currently we list a total of 83 important underground sites. An update is very necessary. Also, the true potential regarding underground sites with large colonies (hundreds / thousands of bats of several species etc.) in Romania probably exceeds 100-150 locations.

Updated counts of bats at each listed site are submitted to the Secretariat
☑ No

Management of important underground sites for bats is in accordance with EUROBATS Publication n°2
☑ Yes

Other relevant activities for the protection of underground habitats
››› Management of important underground sites for bats in accordance with EUROBATS Publication n°2 is done only partially and regionally. In frame of the LIFE+ project in 2010-2013 in North-Western Romania project partners (the EPA of Bihor Country, the Romanian Bat Protection Association and the Emil Racoviță Speleological Institute) closed in a bat friendly way a total of 15 caves in several Natura 2000 sites. Other sites were cleaned, tourism routes and artificial lighting conditions modified, with several sites receiving information boards detailing adequate behaviour for visitors in caves and in the presence of bats. At the end of the project the Ministry of Environment issued Ministerial Ordinance 656/2014 (the BatLife ordinance), to approve the regional action plan for the management of R. ferrumequinum, R. hipposideros, M. myotis, M. oxygnathus (blythii), M. bechsteinii, B. barbastellus and M. schreibersii. In consequence, bat colonies in several caves of North-Western Romanian enjoy fair levels of conservation, including the seasonal restriction of tourism. However, mass tourism and especially, specialized cave tourism is expanding in these areas and across all Romania, so sites must be regularly monitored in order to check the status of colonies. In addition, an apparent legislative paradox needs to be resolved. Even if the BatLife ordinance confers statutory protection for selected cave-dwelling colonies in NW Romania, there are tens of other similarly (or more important) caves and colonies in other parts of the country (ex. the Banat region, Dobrogea, Moldova), which, despite their importance, are not subject to any conservation measure.
Besides this, the Speleological Heritage Commission issues visiting, monitoring and exploration permits into Romania caves taking into account also the nursery and/or hibernation periods in case of caves with known colonies. Also, the management plans of several Natura 2000 sites / nature parks / national parks include provisions about the conservation of caves and cave-dwelling colonies.
The project “MySMIS 120009 - Completarea nivelului de cunoaștere a biodiversității prin implementarea sistemului de monitorizare a stării de conservare a speciilor și habitatelor de interes comunitar din România și raportarea în baza Articolului 17 al Directivei Habitate 92/ 43/CEE”, implemented in 2019-2022 by the Emil Racoviță Cave Research Institute and financed by the Ministry of Environment is monitoring the status of Natura 2000 bat species and that of habitat 8310 - Caves closed for the public.

Resolution 8.5. Conservation and Management of Important Overground Sites for Bats

Most important overground roosts are identified at the national level considering the guidance on site selection developed by the Advisory Committee and using the national databases.

If yes, please give details
››› See details given at Resolution 5.7.

Resolution 8.9. Bats, Insulation and Lining Materials

Are bats included in the impact assessment of insulation programs at a strategic level?

If yes, please give details
››› After years of discussion with the Bucharest city hall officials, we have managed to include pre-insulation bat presence studies in the legislation, also courtesy of the World Bank implication and our constant pressure in the media (Wilderness Research and Conservation NGO).

Are any actions undertaken to ensure that insulation projects comply with national legislation regarding bat protection and conservation by implementing appropriate pre-insulation survey and assessment, mitigation and compensation to avoid roost loss and bat mortality?

Please provide information concerning such actions and attach files, if required
››› Large insulation projects in Bucharest are now subject to a pre-insulation bat study in order to prevent accidental killings. We have yet to see how these projects will be implemented, as they are on paper, yet the insulation continues to be applied. No actions are mentioned in case the experts find a bat colony, but the Wilderness Research and Conservation NGO together with the Visul Luanei Foundation can intervene to exclude the animals if necessary. We have also proposed small bat roost panels in the insulations, where colonies are excluded, and we are awaiting approval for our request.
Bat researchers and the public cannot stop by any means the insulation process of a building. Cases of local cooperation resulting in bat salvage exist, but these are usually by chance.
Only in some cases there is post-insulation survey and only in some cases there is mitigation using bat boxes (on voluntary basis). General guidelines about impact assessment involving bats were developed the Romanian Bat Protection Association in 2008 (in Romanian):
https://lilieci.ro/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/ghid_APLR_impact.pdf
General guidelines about conservation of building dwelling colonies were developed by the Romanian Bat Protection Association in 2016 (in Romanian):
https://lilieci.ro/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/ghid_APLR_adaposturi_antropice.pdf
A guideline about bat rehabilitation that discusses also aspects of insulation was developed by Wilderness Research and Conservation in 2018 (in Romanian):
http://www.wildernessrc.ro/resurse/ghid2018/
One workshop was organized in 2015, by the Romanian Bat Protection Association, in order to train bat

experts in passive exclusion methods and to facilitate the process of informing the public about contact with bats.
One workshop organized by Wilderness Research and Conservation in 2018 for local authorities in Bucharest, in frame of the Bats in the urban environment project, funded by IKEA Romania.

4. Habitats

Click "expand" to see the questions!

Resolution 7.8. Conservation and management of critical feeding areas, core areas around colonies and commuting routes

Are national guidelines which are based on the general guidance given in EUROBATS Publication No. 9 are developed and published? Please provide details or add a file.
››› No

Other activities carried out under this resolution (optional)
››› The only provisions about the general protection of feeding areas and core areas around colonies can be found in management plans of Natura 2000 sites.

Resolution 7.9. Impact of roads and other traffic infrastructures on bats

Bats are taken into account during the planning, construction and operation of roads and other infrastructure projects
☑ Yes

Please give details or attach a file with description
››› According to EIA legislation in Romania, bats should be taken into account during the planning, construction of roads and other infrastructure projects. This only happens if some bat species are listed in the standard data form of the respective Natura 2000 site or the protected area includes a known and important cave roost. Some environmental consultants push the need for extensive bat studies in other areas of the proposed infrastructure projects, as bats are protected not only in the Natura 2000 sites. Some finalised projects have included mitigation measures, such as protection pannels near interchanges, viaducts or even forests. There is a national guideline for mitigation and best practices (for biodiversity, not only bats - only in Romanian), but it is rarely referenced (https://milvus.ro/publication/ghid-de-bune-practici-pentru-planificarea-si-implementarea-investitiilor-din-sectorul-infrastructura-rutiera/).
Currently some important work is being conducted on future highway or railway sectors, and some practices have been upgraded (to static detector monitoring points, fatality searches for the current infrastructure), but these are mostly proposed by the consultants, not normally required by the EPA.

Pre-construction strategic and environmental impacts assessment procedures are mandatory
☑ Required occasionally

Post-construction monitoring
☑ Required occasionally

Raw data from environmental impact assessment and post-construction monitoring is available for independent scientific analysis
☑ No

Research into the impact of new and, where appropriate, existing roads and other infrastructure on bats and into the effectiveness of mitigation measures
☑ No

Resolution 8.6. Bats and Light Pollution

Is national guidance taking due account of the EUROBATS Publication Series No. 8 on Bats and Light Pollution developed and promoted? If yes, please give details or attach a file.
››› No

5. Promoting Public Awareness of Bats and their Conservation and Providing Advice

Click "expand" to see the questions!

International Bat Night. Give details for each year: number of events and number of people participated
››› In 2019 the Centre for Bat Research and Conservation organized the International Bat Night in three Romanian locations: Cluj-Napoca, Constanța and Făgăraș, with a total of around 500 visitors: https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2395162310722341&type=3

After this the COVID era begun, and only in 2022 did the CBRC organize a BatNight again.
In 2020 Wilderness Research and Conservation organized the International Bat Night at the Retezat National Park challet (Nucșoara, Hunedoara County), with approximately 30 participants. Prior to this, we have organized the International Bat Night in 2019 at the National Museum of Natural History ”Grigore Antipa” in 2019 with more than 100 participants.

Details of other important activities which are worth to mention (educational centres, etc.)
››› In the period of 2017-2021, the Centre for Bat Research and Conservation organized / participated in a total of 22 public events (including one event for visually impaired children) and 26 presentations about bats in schools, high-schools and universities. Starting from 2017, the Centre for Bat Research and Conservation, together with the Romanian bat research community, initiated the public designation of “Bat of the year” in Romania, with the aim to raise awareness among the public about those bat species, which the community considers most important. The Bat of the year for Romania in 2019 was Myotis bechsteinii, in 2020-2021 it was Barbastella barbastellus. The CBRC still runs the www.lilieci.ro portal in three languages, with an average of over 1.800 visits / month. In 2020 the CBRC, together with the Wilderness Research and Conservation organized the national bat conference (online, due to COVID).
Wilderness Research and Conservation has organized 42 school presentations prior to the pandemic (2017-2021), regarding the importance of bats, but also has participated in numerous scientific events for the general public, such as: International Researchers Night (EU project), or Bucharest Science Festival. The presentations will begin again in the fall of 2022.

Information on training and awareness raising for forest managers and workers, farmers, road workers, stakeholders involved in insulation of buildings, etc.
››› No activity yet, but a workshop / roundtable discussion will be organized at the 5th Romanian Bat Conference (oct 21-23, 2022), with the participation of experts and architects involved in building restoration.

Resolution 4.11. Recognising the important role of NGOs in bat conservation

Details of NGOs participating in /contributing to bat protection and most valuable activities that have the potential to substantially improve transboundary cooperation and mutual assistance
››› The Centre for Bat Research and Conservation and the Myotis Group for Bat Conservation implements a cross border project with Serbian bat colleagues in the Banat region, financed by the Conservation Leadership Programme, and aimed at conserving the colonies that migrate between the two countries. The CBRC together with Wilderness Research and Conservation also contributes with ultrasound data to the French project about Bat Migration Routes in Europe. CBRC supplied samples for the continental genetic study on Myotis emarginatus (Frantz et al. 2022). A member of the CBRC also co-authored a chapter in the Handbook of European Mammals, on Rhinolophus blasii (Bücs & Csorba 2022), gathering all literature data on the species in one publication.

Resolution 8.13. Insect Decline as a Threat to Bat Populations in Europe

Awareness of the multiple ecological services provided by bats, especially for the agricultural sector and regarding the concerns about the published evidence of dramatic loss of insect biomass in open land is raised with land managers and other stakeholders.

Please, give details
››› Presentations done by Wilderness Research and Conservation at the University of Veterinary Medicine (USAMV), Bucharest with regards to the importance of insect consumption by bats in the agricultural sector.

7. International co-operation

Implementation of Resolutions 7.10, 7.12, 8.3, 8.7

Please give information on the international cooperation with the aim of implementing the recommendations of Resolutions 7.10, 7.12, 8.3, 8.7.
››› The Centre for Bat Research is involved and/or initiated several international cooperation. Currently, jointly with the Myotis Bat Conservation Group, we run a cross-border bat conservation project with Serbian bat researchers in the Iron Gates region, funded by the Conservation Leadership Programme. Also, the CBRC and Myotis are involved in the creation of the first online database of bat data for Romania, but also involving colleagues from the Republic of Moldova with their respective dataset. The CBRC is involved in the sampling process for several studies with Hungarian bat researchers and virologists. During the last 3-4 years we welcomed Hungarian, English, Polish and German bat researchers for joint bat monitoring activities especially in underground locations. One CBRC member participated in the study of Frantz et al. (2022) on Myotis emarginatus population genetics. The CBRC is also coordinating the Romanian data gathering to update the bat section of European Atlas of Mammals, while also being involved in the Bat Migration in Europe project. The Wilderness Research and Conservation is studying the Black Sea migration pathways together with Ukrainian bat researchers, and the WRC also supplies data to the bat Migration in Europe project.

8. Diseases

Click "expand" to see the questions!

Resolution 5.2.Bat rabies in Europe

National bat rabies surveillance network
☑ No

Vaccination of risk groups against rabies is compulsory
☑ No

Details of the institution(s) in charge of recording of all test results and their submission to the World Health Organisation
››› Ministry of Health
Web: http://www.ms.ro/
Email: http://www.ms.ro/contact/
Phone: 021 3072 500; 021 3072 600

10. Climate change

Resolution 8.7. Bats and Climate Change

Resolution 8.7 Bats and Climate Change

Please provide details on changes in species migration, hibernation, reproductive and range shift patterns and consequent species interactions, if those changes have been studied in your country. Add files if required
››› A study has been performed on the hibernation and maternity preferences of bats in caves, (Măntoiu et al. 2022, in press - PlosOne), which highlights climate change as an important factor in bat roost selection.